

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, 23, and 41 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Claims 1-21 and 23 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Engstrom (US Patent Pub. 20020138286). The Examiner stated essentially that Engstrom teaches all the limitations of Claims 1-21 and 23.

Claims 1 and 23 claim, *inter alia*, “defining an access right of the second client, wherein the access right determines a portion of the electronic profile accessible to the second client via the active object; verifying an identity of the second client; and providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client.”

Engstrom teaches a method for generating personality profiles to be provided to Content Providers (see Abstract). Engstrom does not teach “providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. The personality profiles of Engstrom are used in accessing content pages without the need to disclose personally identifiable information to a content provider (see paragraph [0023]). Engstrom's personally profiles are offered to content providers to allow a client to access information.

Engstrom's describes and illustrates in FIG. 4:

1. Client requests information from Content Provider
2. Server requests registration information
3. Client transmits registration information to Content Provider

4. Content Provider provides requested information

The claimed limitation recites:

1. defining an access right of the second client, wherein the access right determines a portion of the electronic profile accessible to the second client via the active object;
2. wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client
3. verifying an identity of the second client; and
4. providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object.

Assuming, *arguendo*, that Engstrom's Client is the provider of registration information, nowhere does Engstrom teach providing an active object to the Content Provider to access the registration information (indeed, the registration information is provided directly to the Content Provider – no such indirect access method/system is taught) and further, nowhere does Engstrom teach that an identity is verified, be that of the Client or the Content Provider.

Further still, it is important to note that Engstrom teaches that different personality profiles may be created for each Content Provider request – that is, a complete personality profile is provide to the Content Provider (see for example, paragraph [0029]). Nowhere does Engstrom teach providing access to a portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, essentially as claimed in Claims 1 and 23.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Engstrom fails to teach “verifying an identity of the second client; and providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the

active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23.

Claims 2-21 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Claim 41 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engstrom in view of Bhoj et al. (USPN 6,304,892). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Engstrom and Bhoj teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 41.

Claim 41 depends from Claim 1. Claim 41 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-21, 23, and 41, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 29, 2007



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889